

ADMINISTRATION TEAM MINUTES

Date: March 12, 2004
Time: 9:00 am
Place: Tacoma AGC Building

<u>Attending</u>	Cathy Arnold	✓	Paul Gonseth	✓	Tina Nelson	_____
	Dave Banke	_____	Mike Hall	_____	Cathy Nicholas	✓
	Jerry Brais	_____	Ann Hegstrom	✓	Mark Rohde	✓
	Forrest Dill	_____	Ron Howard	✓	Mark Scoccolo	_____
	Doug Ficco	✓	Carl Jonasson	✓	Greg Waugh	✓
	Bob Glenn	✓	Dave Jones	✓	Tom Zamzow	_____

Opening

The minutes of the February 12th meeting were approved.
Ron Howard Introduced Bob Glenn and asked the group to add item to the agenda concerning the recent Insurance specification changes. He wanted to know if any one had heard any problems.

Round Table

Greg Waugh of Max J. Kuney Company mentioned that they had been awarded the next WSDOT project on the North South Freeway, in Spokane. It included four bridges ranging in length from 140 to 150 feet, all to be completed this year. They also placed a bid on a 35 million dollars Design Build (DB) project in South East Oregon. Their Portland project has entered into the next stage, and the Lewis and Clark Bridge project is within two months of completion.

Doug Ficco, WSDOT, Southwest Region, stated that all their projects either are or will be out on add soon. Mostly Pavers and Safety work this year. The Nickel Job on SR 500 and 112th is moving along, in fact it appears that it will be finished at least on construction season ahead of schedule. The other Nickel job on Interstate 5 has had a tuff start but is underway. A lot of Design work is going on in the Region. They are hiring as many people as they can find.

Cathy Arnold, WSDOT, Northwest Region, said that she had a lot of smaller jobs and safety projects this year. She mentioned that the SR 522 Job is still on Add. The Region is looking to fill several licensed Professional Engineer positions, three Project Engineers slots, and a whole lot of Assistants.

Paul Gonseth, WSDOT, South Central Region, stated that the weather is great in the Palm Springs of Washington and that their projects are starting up. All the Regions projects will be on add by the end of the month. The Region has just completed a rotation of Assistant Project Engineers, both Jim Dwyer and Paul have new assistants, from the Design side of the house.

MINUTES (cont)

Date: March 12, 2004

Page 2

Round Table (cont)

Carl Jonasson, Balfour-Beatty Construction, Inc. said that they are looking for work. They have a bunch of work in Texas but not a lot in the Northwest. The company has some large training going on in Atlanta, Georgia and Texas. They are waiting to here about the new deal in Oregon concerning Oregon's new approach to Design Build. They have finished their Atlantic Street Project.

Mark Rohde, Concrete Barrier, Inc. stated that they are doing a lot of work in California using polyester concrete. They are pretty much looking for work outside Washington State as there is no WSDOT bridge rehabilitation program this year.

Cathy Nicholas, FHWA, said that the United State Congress has extended the reauthorization of federal funding for Transportation another two months or until the end of April. The U.S. Senate passed a bill by 76 to 21, which includes 318 billion dollars, while the U.S. House of Representatives passed a bill for only 270 Billion dollars. There has also been some talk about putting the revenue from the Ethanol Gas Tax, which now goes to the General Fund, in to the Transportation Trust Fund. She has been making presentations along with Dave Erickson and Joe Devol of WSDOT to local agencies concerning the Super pave mix design method for hot mix pavements. They are also putting on a workshop with WSDOT to discuss accelerated construction techniques. Part of the workshop includes bringing in experts from around the country to look at the 520 floating bridge project.

Bob Glenn, Lakeside Paving of Aberdeen, indicated that they were looking more at private sector work in the Grace Harbor Area as WSDOT does have a lot of work in the area. Bob works as part of the Asphalt Paving Association of Washington / WSDOT Joint Training Team, which recently complete training across the state. Training some 550 people in seven days.

Ann Hegstrom, Kiewit Construction, said that there team was disappointed at coming second out of two for the 3rd Runway project at SeaTac Airport. They have bid some Sound Transit Projects. One is the Beacon Hill Tunnel, a deep station passing under interstate 5. The other is the Retrofit of the Existing Bus Tunnel to accommodate Trains. The have some Design Build work at Fort Lewis and some RFI's in Hawaii for the Army, Navy and Judiciary. The Tacoma Narrow Bridge Project is going well, the Hood Canal Project is putting in drainage. They also have work on a small airport in Phoenix, at Cardinal Stadium and in Alaska.

David Jones, WSDOT, Headquarters Construction, said that he has been working on two main issues. Prompt Pay Task Force and a new effort to develop a specification for allow access to work sites from adjacent properties.

MINUTES (cont)

Date: March 12, 2004

Page 3

Round Table (cont)

Ron Howard, WSDOT, Headquarters Construction, has been working on a few disputes one in South Seattle, the 196th street project and another in Spokane, the Trent Ave. Bridge project. We also have our first claim in five years. Paul's Office is currently evaluated this claim. The State Legislature went home without a Supplemental Transportation Budget.

Bob Glenn asked if the federal government were to come through with the 270 billion would the state have any off the shelf jobs available. Ron stated that the state legislature would have to pass an appropriation that would allow us to spend the money, that is not likely to happen this year. There aren't any projects left on the shelf that can be advanced at this point as the nickel package pretty much took everything off the shelf. The Department's complete disclosure policy and job completion record is intended to position it for the future. By delivering our nickel package projects and highlighting our performance we are already seeing a turn around in the state legislature's view of the Department.

New Business

Ron asked if anyone was experiencing any problems relating to the new insurance specifications.

Greg Waugh, Max J. Kuney Company, said they have not seen or heard of any problems.

Ann Hegstrom, Kiewit Construction Company, said that they also have not experienced any problems.

Bob Glenn, Lakeside Industries said that they had adjusted their insurance, but that they had heard that Superior Asphalt's Insurance carrier was not able to cover the new insurance requirements. They did hear from the insurance industry that they had concerns about the changes.

Mark Rohde, Concrete Barrier, Inc., said that they did not have any problems, but that at the Associated members meeting of the Asphalt Pavement Association of Washington insurance representatives expressed concerns.

Carl Jonasson, Balfour-Beatty Construction, Inc., said that they have not heard anything yet from Atlanta.

Ron said that we would like to give the specification some time to see how well it will work and that he will pass the information on to the AGC / WSDOT Lead Team. He also pointed out that there were other changes that were made that already have been beneficial. Now at some point in the job the OCPI can be dropped and there is now a deductible, before the changes there was none.

MINUTES (cont)

Date: March 12, 2004

Page 4

New Business (cont)

Ron then turned the discussion over to Bob Glenn so that he could raise the issue of reconsidering the requirements of construction signs as they relate to NCHRP 350 requirements. Bob took the group through the crash requirements and the implantation meetings on the issue with Rudy Malfabon, former State Construction Engineer. The industry was concerned at the time that these requirements are phased in to allow contractors time to purchase the signs. They were also concerned that once signs were selected that the requirements not change, forcing the contractor to again purchase additional signs. Cloth signs were allowed at the time but since Olympic Region has told Bob that cloth signs will not be allowed. Olympic Region has further required the use of Aluminum or plywood signs while allowing State Maintenance forces to use cloth signs. This condition has lead to frustration among some in the industry who spent \$100,000 on cloth signs and now finds that they may not meet the specifications. These signs cost between \$300 and \$500, including the bases. It was for all these reasons Bob felt that the group should consider reexamining this issue.

Cathy Nicholas stated that at the time of the initial discussions concerning NCHRP 350 the only signs that meet the requirements were the cloth ones.

Paul Gonseth noted that survey crews use cloth signs, and the only problem that he has experienced with them is that the base tends to bend over in windy conditions.

Greg Waugh noted that they had used a variety of signs when they worked on the SR 500 Design Build project in the Southwest Region. Some of the crews liked the cloth ones as they were lighter and you could cram a lot of them in the vehicles. The aluminum ones are lighter than the older signs but tended to rap around the post when used on barrier.

Ron Howard asked if the group wanted to add this to the Team's List.

Mark Rohde stated that the standard specification do allow the use of cloth of signs.

The group agreed to add this issue to the list.

Old Business

Ron Howard then told the group that 28 out of 32 surveys sent out on the Traffic Control Trial Specifications have been returned. He asked for a volunteer to go through the surveys and provide a summary for the Team. Carl Jonasson agreed to take on the task.

David Jones reported that the Prompt Pay Task Force had meet on February 26, 2004 and started the process of looking at prompt pay. The group identified eleven different areas to look at, the top three were change orders, force accounts and deferrals. The group when asked what they

MINUTES (cont)

Date: March 12, 2004

Page 5

Old Business (cont)

expected to get out of the process listed the following items. Streamlining of the change order process on large projects, look into the reasons for deferrals, achieve consistency among projects, identify tools to get documentation turned in by contractors and the avoidance of late payments.

The next meeting is scheduled for April 6, 2004 @ John Chi's Project Office.

Ron Howard next introduced the next agenda item by thanking Paul Gonseth for his efforts at rewriting the second paragraph of section 1-08.3 for the group. Ron also reminded everyone that this specification is intended to cover 80 to 90 percent of the projects and that there would be a General Special Provision for the simple bar chart type of projects and another GSP for the more complex I-90 large projects. Ron also asked if everyone was comfortable with the term CPM or Critical Path Method. The group said yes.

There was a long discussion over whether or not calendar days should be shown on the schedule submitted. Ann Hegstrom noted that there are nine different calendars that can be used with the software. Greg Waugh stated that you needed to have both a start date and an end date in order to have the software compute your early start dates and late start dates. Ann also noted that you needed dates to determine your resources. Ron pointed out that you might well have a schedule that you as a contractor use to manage your resources that shows calendar days and one you give to the state that only shows working days.

Several members of the group placed examples on the board of different working schedule scenarios. The group went on to talk about what might happen if you have some dates such as fish windows or specified completion dates. Ron pointed out that the standard specifications are set up to work with working days and the contracting agency grants unworkable days. If work cannot be completed on a critical path item due to weather or another condition beyond the contractors control an unworkable day is granted and the completion date moves one day. If this causes the work to slip such that the work on the critical path can not continue during a window that it is allowed then those days would be considered unworkable days. If the contracting agency has to make that date or the mayor wants the road opened to hold a parade then the contracting agency can pay to accelerate the work. Greg pointed out that it could be near impossible to convince the contracting agency to grant an unworkable day. Paul pointed out that non-critical items of work can continue or be allowed during these times. Doug Ficco stated that sometimes permits don't allow but one window in which to work and if you miss that one or out of luck. Ron suggested that should be a red flag to the contracting agency and that we had better make sure during the design phase that it is possible to get the work done to make the window.

There was a discussion of different types of working days, i.e. Mondays through Friday are working days except for holidays. Some contracts require night work or count every day as a working day.

MINUTES (cont)

Date: March 12, 2004

Page 6

Old Business (cont)

Ron surmised that there are really three conditions concerning unworkable days one you don't care and we don't care this is likely the scenario when we agree to a winter shut down. Two we don't care but you do, the fish window or winter shut down when we either can't allow you to work or the weather is such that we don't see that you can. Usually in this scenario we don't charge working days and you work on non-critical path items. The third case is when you don't care but we do, this is the mayor's parade. In this case we pay you additional money to accelerate your activities to make the date.

Ron then asked how we wanted to deal with this issue of calendar days versus working days. How does the group as advisors to the WSDOT think we should administer contracts? The group agreed to stay with working days. Ron then agreed to take another stab at revising the second paragraph.

Ron then introduced the idea of allowing the contractor to submit an early completion schedule and then allow them to choose between two options. One would be to consider the difference between the early completion and contract working days as project float to be used by either party. The second option would be to reduce the working day in the contract. Greg said that they had a long discussion about this issue and could not see where the contracting agency was taking on any additional risk by allowing the contractor to submit an early schedule and not reducing the contract days. Ron pointed out that the same work done in 300 days is all on the critical path were it would not be on the critical path if done in 400 days, there is float. We may run in to extended overhead sooner on the early schedule. The discussion on this subject was not completed as time ran out and the group broke for lunch. Several of the members of the group needed to attend the afternoon AGC / WSDOT Lead Team Meeting, which was to be held in the same facility.

Future Meetings

April 16th, 2004 @ Tacoma AGC (9:00 am)

May 14th, 2004 @ Tacoma AGC (9:00 am in the Boardroom)

June 11th, 2004 @ Tacoma AGC (9:00 am)

Assignment List

<u>Who</u>	<u>What</u>	<u>By When</u>
Carl Jonasson	Summary of Traffic Control Survey	April 16, 2004
Ron Howard	Revised second paragraph	April 16, 2004

MINUTES (cont)

Date: March 12, 2004

Page 7

Team's "Round Tuit" List

1. Traffic Control Provisions
2. Progress Schedules
3. Short-term Scheduling
4. Re-visit NCHRP 350 and Standard Specifications of Traffic Signs
5. Insurance Cost/ Reimbursement
6. Tort Claims Liability/Accident Reports
7. Bid Item for On-site Overhead
8. Disputes Review Boards
9. Section 1-08.8, p5.c—Extensions for Quantity Overruns?
10. Joint Training—Documentation
11. Payroll, Wage Administration procedures
12. Materials on Hand provisions
13. Web-Based Construction Management